



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 2, 2004

Ms. Julia Gannaway
Lynn, Pham, Moore & Ross, P.C.
1320 South University Drive, Suite 720
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2004-9344

Dear Ms. Gannaway:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212268.

The City of Athens (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information concerning a named city police officer.¹ You also inform us that the requestor subsequently delivered to the city an affidavit from a witness to an incident involving the officer, requesting a copy of a statement given by the witness. You indicate that the city is releasing some responsive personnel information to the requestor. You claim that the remainder of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ You indicate that the city contacted the requestor to seek clarification of the request, and you state "the City has concluded that [the requestor] is not interested in items other than [the named officer's] personnel files and possibly the documents containing information concerning the ongoing criminal investigation of [the named officer]." See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that a governmental body may ask the requestor to clarify the request if what information is requested is unclear to the governmental body); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999)(discussing requests for clarification).

² We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. You contend that a portion of the submitted records are excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides in pertinent part:

(a) The director [of the fire fighters' or police officers' civil service] or the director's designee shall maintain a personnel file on each fire fighter and police officer. The personnel file must contain any letter, memorandum, or document relating to:

...

(2) any misconduct by the fire fighter or police officer if the letter, memorandum, or document is from the employing department and if the misconduct resulted in disciplinary action by the employing department in accordance with this chapter ...

...

(g) A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

You indicate that the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 of the Local Government Code provides for the creation of two personnel files for police officers and fire fighters: one that must be maintained by the city's civil service director or the director's designee and another that may be maintained by the city's fire and police departments. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a).³ *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex.

³ Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See id.* §§ 143.051-.055.

App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. See Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, a document relating to a police officer or fire fighter’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b). Information that reasonably relates to a police officer or fire fighter’s employment relationship with the department and that is maintained in a department’s internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied); *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state that a portion of the submitted information consists of records contained in the internal personnel file maintained by the Athens Police Department (the “department”) for the officer at issue. Upon review of your comments and the submitted information, we find that the submitted sample records contained in the department’s internal personnel file for the officer at issue are confidential under section 143.089(g). Accordingly, we agree the city must withhold such information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

We next address your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code with respect to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the remaining records at issue relate to a pending criminal investigation. Based on your representations and our review, we determine that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

We note, however that basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.108. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d 177. See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic

information, the city may withhold the remaining submitted records from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1). We note that you have the discretion to release all or part of this information that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

In summary, the city must withhold records maintained in the internal personnel file for the officer at issue pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining submitted records pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 212268

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Fred Head
Attorney & Counselor
P.O. Box 312
Athens, Texas 75751-0312
(w/o enclosures)